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## 1NC Politics

### UQ

#### Hillary wins the nomination now

Adam Edelman, April 17, 2016, Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump hope N.Y. primary wins lead to nominations, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are hoping that if they can make it here, they can make it anywhere.¶ With just a day to go before the Empire State's first meaningful presidential primaries in decades, the former secretary of state and bombastic billionaire are poised for victories that could ultimately help propel them to their parties' respective nominations.¶ Aided by a strong debate performance, an endorsement from the Daily News' editorial board and a damning transcript from the same editorial board's meeting with her competitor, Clinton has opened up a substantial 12-point lead over Sanders in the latest RealClearPolitics polling average in New York, beating the progressive Vermont senator ¶ 53%-41%.¶ Throughout the final debate between the duo, last Thursday from the Brooklyn Navy Yard, Clinton repeatedly hammered her progressive rival over his perceived allegiance to gun-makers and well as his inability to articulate a plan to break up "too big to fail" U.S. banks — both which surfaced during his April 1 sit-down with The News and have appeared to affect his standing in the Empire State in polls — leading experts to wonder, not whether Clinton will win, but by how much.¶ "If she beats him by more than 10 points, and all of the polls show her there by a comfortable margin, the math becomes completely implausible for Sanders to win the nomination," David Birdsell, dean of the Public Affairs School at Baruch College, explained to The News.¶ "Hillary probably doesn't put this away with pledged delegates alone, but that's more likely after a double-digit Clinton win on Tuesday," he added. "And assuming Pennsylvania (where 210 delegates will be at stake on April 26) goes for Hilly too, Sanders would have to win everything else by wide margins to come out on top," he added.

#### Hillary only has a slim lead against Trump – could go either way

Ryu Spaeth Feb 2016, https://newrepublic.com/minutes/130434/donald-trump-beat-hillary-clinton-general-election

According to RCP’s average of polls, Clinton enjoys only a slim lead over Trump in a head-to-head match-up. You have to think that her lead will climb once the Democratic Party revs up the Trump attack machine, which the GOP has so far mysteriously declined to use. But at the same time, in a polarized, nearly evenly divided electorate, there’s only so much the Democratic Party can do to expand its coalition. It’s unlikely that the editors of National Review and other anti-Trumpists will flock to Clinton. The real question is whether Trump can consolidate the GOP and perhaps even make inroads with blue-collar workers who have traditionally voted Democratic. As Noam Scheiber reported, even labor unions are interested in Trump, given his idiosyncratic position on trade. So, maybe?

#### The dems have a slight edge, but it’s close – best model confirms. Obama’s popularity is the deciding factor. Long ’15:

Time-tested model says a Democrat will win in 2016 by Heather Long @byHeatherLong August 6, 2015: 4:15 PM ET money.cnn.com/2015/08/06/news/economy/2016-democratic-victory-moodys-analystics/

Republicans might be in the spotlight this week with their first big debate, but Democrats received some very encouraging news. Moody's Analytics, which has correctly predicted every presidential race since Ronald Reagan's victory in 1980, just came out with its forecast for 2016. It will be an extremely close race, but the next president will be a Democrat, according to Moody's. This doesn't mean that Hillary Clinton is on her way back to the White House. The model that Moody's uses doesn't focus on individual candidates. Instead, it predicts which party will win in every state, so it forecasts the results of the Electoral College. Related: Look out, Trump. Bush and Christie vow to double economic growth Moody's says the Democratic nominee will get [with] 270 electoral votes -- the minimum number of votes needed to win -- while the Republican nominee will accumulate 268 votes. The model correctly predicted every state in the 2012 election and has a nearly 90% success rate in forecasting each state accurately since 1980. It will all come down to Virginia and Ohio this time because Moody's predicts that Republicans will win Florida. At the moment, Moody's says Virginia will go Democratic and Ohio will swing Republican, but that could change. "If President Obama's approval rating falls by any more than 2 percentage points by Election Day, Virginia will swing and the Republicans will win the president," the report says. Related: Bush stumbles into debate night So what is the key to such accurate predictions? Moody's says it's all about economics. The model takes into account how the economy is doing in each state. The researchers have tested a lot of variables over the years, but the best ones are family ("household") income, home values and gas prices. If those three variables are going up, it favors the incumbent party. If they're not, people want change in Washington. "The economy's performance strongly favors the Democratic nominee for president," says Moody's. Moody's points out that household incomes have been steadily improving lately and are likely to go up further before Election Day. "The only missing ingredient is stronger wage growth, which is expected to pick up in the coming months as the job market approaches full employment," the authors wrote.

### Link

#### A handgun ban is wildly unpopular – it’s the tipping point for competitive states. This also means Republicans would undo the aff if they win, so the aff has zero solvency. Scher ’15:

Will Any Presidential Candidate Support Banning Handguns? OCTOBER 2, 2015 Bill Scher Bill Scher https://ourfuture.org/20151002/will-any-presidential-candidate-support-banning-all-handguns

Politicians generally avoid proposing handgun bans because the position doesn’t fit into the frame of exempting “responsible gun owners” from new regulations. No one needs an assault rifle to hunt or to protect themselves. But plenty of Americans keep handguns thinking that it will protect them from harm. Politicians are loathe to advocate that the government “take their guns away.” However, the reality is, as physicist David Robert Grimes put it, “actually owning and using a firearm hugely increases the risk of being shot.” Of course, this is a political impossibility for the foreseeable future. The current Republican Congress won’t even pass an expan[d]sion of background checks, and a previous Republican Congress allowed the Clinton-era assault weapons ban to expire. A handgun ban also could run afoul of the Supreme Court, as it is currently constituted. But will any presidential candidate be willing to push the envelope, shake up the debate, and put a handgun ban on the table? It’s unlikely to be Sen. Bernie Sanders. Gun control is pretty much the only area where Sanders, long-time representative of rural hunting state, could be classified as a moderate. He opposed background checks in 1993, though supported them in 2013. He once supported a law protecting gun manufacturers from lawsuits, but he also voted for the assault weapons ban and supports closing the so-called gun show loophole. His rhetoric on the subject involves a bit of triangulation, “I think that urban America has got to respect what rural America is about, where 99 percent of the people in my state who hunt are law abiding people.” It’s unlikely to be Hillary Clinton. While she is stressing gun control in her campaign — a rare opportunity for her to get to Bernie’s left — she is a pragmatist at heart. Democrats for years have been careful to avoid sounding like “gun grabbers,” skirting the gun control issue so they can be competitive in states with high gun ownership like Colorado, Iowa and Nevada. In fact, if Democrats had not pursued this strategy, arguably Barack Obama never would have become president. For Clinton to push the issue now is shift left from where Obama was rhetorically in 2008 and 2012. But what’s on the table are provisions like “universal background checks, cracking down on illegal gun traffickers, and keeping guns out of the hands of domestic abusers and stalkers.” A handgun ban is not in the cards.

### Impact

#### A Republican president would overturn COP 21, which is the lynchpin against global warming. Freking ‘15

KEVIN FREKING, The Associated Press Posted: Sunday, December 13, 2015, 3:06 AM http://www.philly.com/philly/news/politics/20151213\_ap\_9e941f0026124fd09459f8597277e433.html#xfJtXVfLegfrCDhU Obama optimism over climate pact tempered by GOP opposition

WASHINGTON (AP) - President Barack Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry hailed the newly passed international climate change agreement as a major achievement that could help turn the tide on global warming, but got a quick reminder that Republicans will fight it all the way. Obama said the climate agreement made Saturday night by almost 200 nations "can be a turning point for the world" and credited his administration for playing a key role. He and Kerry predicted it would prompt widespread spending on clean energy and help stem carbon pollution blamed for global warming. "We've shown that the world has both the will and the ability to take on this challenge," Obama said from the White House. He said the climate agreement "offers the best chance we have to save the one planet we have." "In short, this agreement will mean less of the carbon pollution that threatens our planet and more of the jobs and economic growth driven by low-carbon investments," Obama said. Obama said the world leaders meeting in Paris "met the moment" and that people can be more confident "the planet will be in better shape for the next generation." Obama said the agreement is not perfect, but sets a framework that will contain periodic reviews and assessments to ensure that countries meet their commitments to curb carbon emissions. The immediate reaction of leading Republican critics was a stark reminder of the conflict that lies ahead. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky said Obama is "making promises he can't keep" and should remember that the agreement "is subject to being shredded in 13 months." McConnell noted that the presidential election is next year and the agreement could be reversed if the GOP wins the White House. And Republican Sen. James Inhofe of Oklahoma said that Americans can expect the administration to cite the agreement as an excuse for establishing emission targets for every sector of the U.S. economy. Kerry said from Paris: "I have news for Senator Inhofe. The United States of America has already reduced its emissions more than any other country in the world." "This has to happen," he said of the agreement. "I believe this will continue because I just personally cannot believe that any person who doesn't understand the science and isn't prepared to do for the next generation what we did here today and follow through on it cannot and will not be elected president of the United States." In an interview taped for CBS' "Face the Nation," Kerry called the climate pact "a breakaway agreement" that will change how countries make decisions and "spur massive investment." He acknowledged that a Republican president could undo the agreement, but said there is already plenty of evidence that climate change is having a damaging and expensive impact with more intense storms, wildfires and melting glaciers.

#### Warming causes extinction from Earth exploding.

**Chalko 4** Dr. Tom J. Chalko, MSc, PhD (Head of Geophysics Division, Scientific E Research P/L, Mt Best, Australia). “No second chance? Can Earth explode as a result of Global Warming?” NU Journal of Discovery. Revised October 30th, 2004. http://nujournal.net/core.pdf

**Consequences of** global **warming are** far more **serious** than previously imagined. **The REAL danger** for our entire civilization **comes** not from slow climate changes, but **from overheating of the planetary interior. Life** on Earth **is possible** only **because of** the **efficient cooling of the** planetary **interior** - a process that is **limited primarily by the atmosphere**. This cooling is responsible for a thermal balance between the heat from the core reactor, the heat from the Sun and the radiation of heat into space, so that the average temperature on Earth’s surface is about 13 degrees Celsius. This article examines the possibility of **overheating and** the **“meltdown” of the solid planetary core due to** the atmospheric pollution trapping progressively more solar heat (**the** so-called **greenhouse effect**) and reducing the cooling rate of the planetary interior. The most serious consequence of such a ”meltdown” could be centrifugal segregation of unstable isotopes in the molten part of the spinning planetary core. Such segregation **can “enrich”** the **nuclear fuel in the core** to the point of **creating conditions for** a chain reaction and a **gigantic atomic explosion**. Will Earth become another ”asteroid belt” in the Solar system? It is common knowledge (experiencing seasons) that solar heat is the dominant factor that determines temperatures on the surface of Earth. Under the polar ice however, the contribution of solar heat is minimal and this is where the increasing contribution of the heat from the planetary interior can be seen best. Rising polar ocean temperatures and melting polar ice caps should therefore be the first symptoms of overheating of the inner core reactor. While politicians and businessmen debate the need for reducing greenhouse emissions and take pride to evade accepting any responsibility, the process of overheating the inner core reactor has already begun - polar oceans have become warmer and polar caps have begun to melt. Do we have enough imagination, intelligence and integrity to comprehend the danger before the situation becomes irreversible? **There will be NO SECOND CHANCE...**

**Extinction comes first. Bostrom :[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**These reflections on** moral uncertainty suggest[s] **an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our** [that] present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not **now** know**—at least not in concrete detail—**what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity**; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey.** If we are **indeed profoundly** uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is **a** great option value in preserving**—and ideally improving—**our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is **plausibly** the best way **available to us** to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.

### Turns Case

#### Republicans mean more patriarchy – laundry list of policies, which inherently outweighs on scope of impacts. Haraldsson ‘15:

I Would Like to Say Goodbye to Patriarchy By: Hrafnkell Haraldsson Saturday, September, 29th, 2012, 8:14 am www.politicususa.com/2012/09/29/goodbye-patriarchy.html

I would like to take the time to say goodbye to patriarchy. I’d like to say goodbye to the idea that women are nothing but sexual playthings, something to be undressed, or something to be used to satisfy the male ego. I would like to put forward the idea that women are people too, somebody who, like another guy, you can pal around, not somebody to get drunk and take advantage of. I’d like to put forward that idea that we can talk to women and take what they have to say seriously. The idea that on some basic level, women are absolutely equal with men, and like the Constitution says, have the same inalienable rights. Sadly, I cannot say any of that. Patriarchy shows no sign of going quietly into the night. Look at not only the anti-woman legislation coming from Republicans everywhere, legislation attacking women’s reproductive choices and health, but at comments about rape, about equal pay for equal work. Can we really expect people who think women’s bodies are magical to treat women like people? It was one thing for ancient peoples to be confused by the workings of the human body but in the 21st century, we know where babies come from. At least, liberals do. Why do Republicans cling to ideas that, like David Niose said, would have been out of date a century ago? Look at Todd Akin and his rape comments. And he’s not alone or even the first. Imagine having somebody running as a major-party vice presidential candidate who thinks there is such a thing as “forcible” rape? And we do. I think Abe Lincoln would have bitch-slapped Paul Ryan and felled him like a rotten tree. But look at that charming smile. Todd Akin had something to say about pay too, you know. He isn’t just interested in raping women’s bodies. He wants to rape them economically too. He says businesses should be able to pay women less than men, showing that on a fundamental level Tood Akin misunderstands the principles upon which America was founded. He defended voting against the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act by saying, Well, first of all, the premise of your question is that I’m making that particular distinction. I believe in free enterprise. I don’t think the government should be telling people what you pay and what you don’t pay. I think it’s about freedom. If someone what’s to hire somebody and they agree on a salary, that’s fine, however it wants to work. So, the government sticking its nose into all kinds of things has gotten us into huge trouble. Coming from a politician belonging to a party that has also attacking restrictions on child labor, perhaps this attitude should not surprise us. After all, how successful can a wealthy Republican be if he can’t underpay and overwork the women and children? After all, if they’re not weak and malnourished enough he won’t be able to get to the lifeboats ahead of them when the ocean liner sinks. Meanwhile, Forbes reported in May that “former General Electric chairman and chief Jack Welch thinks women just aren’t working hard enough.” Oh, that’s all it is. Men get paid more because they work harder? There you go ladies. Forbes’ Jenn Goudreau was moved to say, “It should be no surprise to anyone breathing that performance matters. But by the way Welch framed this conversation, one would infer that he assumes women are just 3% of corporate CEOs, 7% of top earners, 14% of executive officers and 16% of board members because they’re slacking off.” Women haven’t missed all this. They are as aware of what Republicans are saying – and doing – as they are of what President Obama is saying – and doing. They heard Obama when he said, “My administration will continue to fight for a woman’s right for equal pay for equal work.” Ann Romney says she wants women to wake up, but I think women have woken up. What is this Republican[s] message, that patriarchy is good for you? That it’s all for your own good, and by the way, yes, we insist? After all, what business do women [should] have working in the first place? They’re supposed to be at home, pregnant and having babies and taking care of her man. What difference does it make that as CNN reported back in 2004, midway through Bush’s administration, that “according to the AFL-CIO, the average 25-year-old woman who works full-time, year-round until she retires at age 65 (if that’s when she’s able to retire) will earn $523,000 less than the average working man?” It’s all because of the woman’s choices. Like rape, it’s all the woman’s fault. Yeah, I don’t think we’re at patriarchy’s end, just yet. That same CNN article predicated equal pay not before 2050, leaving another couple of generations of women to work their fingers to the bone for less. Another Republican administration bent on imposing patriarchal values out of the Bible rather than Democratic values out of the U.S. Constitution will set women back even farther. Lilly Ledbetter, in a special report to the CNN Election Center, wrote back in April that America has Romney’s answer on the question of equal pay for women: crickets. We’ll get back to you on that. Given a chance to embrace and engage America’s women, the Romney campaign acted like deer in headlights. There is no doubt Romney would like women to vote for him. But Romney can’t appeal to women without enraging the patriarchal forces he so much depends upon, the voices of religious extremism and bigotry. He wants women to vote for him anyway, just because, I suppose, it’s a woman’s place to do what a man wants her to do. I don’t call that much of a sales pitch. The simple fact is that in the America of 2012, the forces of patriarchy have coalesced in the Republican Party. It’s not to say there aren’t misogynists out there who are liberals or progressives, but as a party, as a politico-theological movement, the GOP has embraced the ancient idea that man is the master and woman should submit to him simply because that’s how God wants it. You can’t reason with these people because they will tell you that you don’t negotiate with God. The only defense you have is to keep them out of power in the first place. And keep in the back of your mind the fact that the last time they were in a position of authority like that, they kept it for over sixteen hundred years. I don’t know about you, but if they win, talk of equal pay in 2050 is hopelessly optimistic

#### Republicans glorify masculinity causing an ideological shift, outweighs on duration. Winter ‘10

Masculine Republicans and Feminine Democrats: Gender and Americans’ Explicit and Implicit Images of the Political Parties Nicholas J. G. Winter Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2010 faculty.virginia.edu/nwinter/papers/winter-pb-forthcoming.pdf

If one of the overt Democratic lines of attack against Republicans is that Republicans are conducting a war on women, one of the low-simmering, implicit lines of attack from Republicans is that Democrats are conducting a war on men, or at least traditional views of masculinity. The idea of the effete, feminized liberals threatening to suffocate the last remaining expression of true manliness is rife in Republican rhetoric. They are selling the right wing as the last refuge of real men. When the Chris Christie bridge scandal erupted, Brit Hume, the Fox senior political analyst, said in Christie’s defense: “I would have to say that in this sort of feminized atmosphere in which we exist today, guys who are masculine and muscular like that in their private conduct, kind of old-fashioned tough guys, run some risks.” He sought to clarify this way:“By which I mean that men today have learned the lesson the hard way that if you act like a kind of an old-fashioned guy’s guy, you’re in constant danger of slipping out and saying something that’s going to get you in trouble and make you look like a sexist or make you look like you seem thuggish or whatever. That’s the atmosphere in which he operates. This guy is very much an old-fashioned masculine, muscular guy, and there are political risks associated with that. Maybe it shouldn’t be, but that’s how it is.”Guy’s guys are an aggrieved class in that world. Portraying Republican men as manly and Democratic ones as effete has been a consistent line of attack against post-Bill Clinton Democratic presidential candidates. As Glenn Greenwald put it in 2007, “For some time now, it has been commonplace for Democratic candidates to be depicted as gender-confused freaks.” He added, “One can make a strong argument, as some have, that those personality-attack themes have played a far larger role in the outcome of the last two presidential elections than any substantive issues, and liberals simply have nothing close to the potency of the right-wing filth machine in advancing these gender themes.” The problem with having your message powered by machismo is that it reveals what undergirds such a stance: misogyny and chauvinism. The masculinity for which they yearn draws its meaning and its value from juxtaposition with a lesser, vulnerable, narrowly drawn femininity. We have seen recent research suggesting that men with daughters are more likely to be Republican and a study finding that men with sisters are more likely to be Republican. The study of men with sisters was conducted by researchers at Stanford Graduate School of Business and Loyola Marymount University. A report from Stanford about the study concluded, “Watching their sisters do the chores ‘teaches’ boys that housework is simply women’s work, and that leads to a traditional view of gender roles [is] — a position linked to a predilection for Republican politics.” And as Republican candidates oppose a full range of reproductive options for women as well as same-sex marriage, and publicly bemoan the notion that Democrats make women “believe that they are helpless without Uncle Sugar” around to “control their libido,” in the words of Mike Huckabee, the former Arkansas governor and a possible Republican presidential contender, the Republican Party is, in fact, becoming a shrinking, male-dominated party. Only one Democrat has won the male vote in presidential races since 1992 — and that was Barack Obama, who won it in 2008 by one percentage point.

## Case

\*\*\*Ask in CX if substitution turns and consequentialist turns link in.

### Offense

#### 1. The origins of anti-gun sentiment are all constructed by a patriarchal society- your authors are epistemologically suspect- ignore all of them.

Charles 11:

**Lindsay K Charles Winter 2011**

**(Feminist and Firearms: Why are So Many Women Anti-Choice? Cardozo Journal of Law and Gender. \* Boston College Law School, J.D., 2009; University of Notre Dame, B.B.A., 2003. I wrote this article during a fellowship with the NRA Civil Rights Defense Fund, and I am now an associate at Goodwin Procter LLP in Boston, Massachusetts.** [**http://www.cardozolawandgender.com/uploads/2/7/7/6/2776881/17-2\_charles\_ws.pdf**](http://www.cardozolawandgender.com/uploads/2/7/7/6/2776881/17-2_charles_ws.pdf)**)**

**There is no universal reason to explain the anti-gun sentiment among women**. Individual women may identify with, or be subconsciously influenced by, one or more of the following reasons to varying degrees, or, indeed, reasons not explored here. One reason for women’s aversion to guns may be that they have different values and morals than men. Some scholars theorize that women value interdependence, community, connection with others, and trust; men value independence, autonomy, power, and aggression.6 The various explanations given for these differences are biological, evolutionary, psychological, and sociological. Whatever the cause, this theory could help explain women’s general dislike for guns. Firearms may be seen as antithetical to the female ideals of connection and trust, furthering instead the male ideals of independence, power, and aggression. Unlike men, **women are thought to be**—and are expected to be—**pacifist and selfsacrificing**.7 Of course, **one wonders how long it will take before they ask themselves** the famous Dr. Phil question: “**How’s that been working** out for you?” Guns themselves are seen as symbols of masculinity and dominance. 8 One law review article states: “[j]ust as sex is the ultimate weapon of patriarchy used to penetrate and possess women, the gun’s sole purpose is to intrude and wound its victim.”9 Perhaps men are better able to identify with the concept of a bullet being expelled from a gun and penetrating its target. And most little girls do not look forward to their first gun as a rite of passage.10 Nor would one ever describe a woman experiencing an orgasm as “getting her gun off.” Simply put, guns are phallic and give a feeling of power—two things women may not be able to relate to. A more sinister explanation is that “**gun control is**, **symbolically, male control**.”11 Sociologist H. Taylor Buckner found that “[o]verall, the **women who support gun control do so in the context of controlling male violence** and sexuality.”12 Interestingly, “**women who have been subjected to force** (almost always **by men) do not think that more gun laws will reduce violence against women.**”13 Women who have been victimized by men are all too aware of the damage a man can inflict with just his bare hands, feet, or common household items**. Women may** also **want to avoid being seen as** having **masculine** traits such as gun ownership or proficiency **because it is considered unladylike** and unattractive.14 Moreover, **some women might not be able to see themselves in the role of a protector** or defender, **and so delegate this responsibility to the man** in their life or the police.15 These **women** may be willing to **sacrifice** some measure of **security** in order **to stay within prescribed gender norms**. Another explanation for women’s dislike of guns may be simple ignorance. Boys are far more likely than girls to be socialized with firearms, and women therefore have much less experience with guns than men do. 16 Knowledge of and experience with firearms is negatively correlated with support for gun control, which intuitively makes sense: the more one knows about guns, the less afraid she is.17 People who believe that guns are unpredictable, or who anthropomorphize them as “having a mind of their own,” would therefore be less likely to support gun control if they were instructed in proper gun handling and informed about firearms’ various safety features. Women who have never been taught to handle firearms may understandably be afraid of the unknown. Misleading statistics, myths, and common misperceptions may also be partly to blame. For instance, a common claim is that a gun is more likely to be used against a family member than used in self-defense; however, the study on which that claim is based only counted defensive gun uses (“DGUs”) that resulted in the criminal’s death.18 This renders the study meaningless, since a criminal will usually run away as soon as he sees a gun, and no shots are ever fired.19 The resulting statistic is extremely deceptive because less than 1% of life-saving DGUs result in a criminal’s death, which means that over 99% of life-saving DGUs were not counted in the study.20 This is just one example of the many ways statistics can be manipulated to further an anti-gun agenda. If open-minded women educated themselves about guns and self-defense, they would discover that many of their fears are unfounded. **The saddest explanation is that society**, including women, **generally tolerates violence against women**.21 **Rape** **is** ostensibly illegal, but “overwhelmingly **permitted in fact**.”22 Domestic violence and rape survivors are still stigmatized, shamed, and blamed—even by other women. **Women** may be **blam**ing **survivors** **because they do not want to believe that they** themselves **could** ever **become a victim**; the idea being that if the survivor did something “wrong” or “brought it on herself,” then “it can’t happen to me.”23 And **women who convince themselves they will never be victims see no need for self-defense**—for themselves or for anyone else.24 **Both men and women downplay the devastating effects of rape and domestic violence when they suggest that women should submit rather than defend their bodily integrity**,25 or tell them their self-defense efforts would be incompetent and counterproductive.26 All of this should be offensive to an adult woman who considers herself a full-fledged person.

#### 2. Self defense is necessary to break down the systemic violence that rape perpetuates and the vision of women as masochistic and defenseless.

Charles 2:

Women need to get angry about being targeted for victimization just because they are women.29 **Rape** and domestic violence **are** not simply the results of many individual decisions; they are also **a product of the patriarchal system that allows the systematic domination** and disrespect **of women**.30 **Rape has been compared to lynching**31 **because** **it** **is** on the one hand **pervasive and systemic** (it is overwhelmingly women who are targeted for rape) and on the other hand arbitrary and random (all kinds of women are raped, young and old, regardless of race or class, in a broad variety of circumstances, thus making formulaic solutions like “avoid X to avoid rape” impossible),32 so **fear is omnipresent**. Thus, **men use rape to subjugate women,** much like lynching was used to subjugate southern blacks: the knowledge that one could be targeted quells every member of the group.33 Professor MacKinnon said it best: “[w]hat [women] need is change: for men to stop hurting them and using them because they are women, and for everyone to stop letting them do it because they are men.”34 **Feminists** have **work**ed **for reforms aimed at recognizing women as people** worthy of equality and respect, and this endeavor has been quite successful in some areas,35 but there is still much work to be done.36 Changing hearts and minds is the ultimate goal. However, until that dream becomes a reality, **women’s armed self-defense may be** both **a strategy for achieving the goal**, **and a** stopgap **measure to prevent violence by men who refuse to see** all **women as** fully **human**. **Rape is tolerated**, in part, **because** **most of the time only women are hurt** and no one dies. **If women began defending themselves with firepower, the authorities might** sit up and **take notice**. **This strategy provided** some **benefits for Ku Klux Klan victims** in the 1930s: [A]rmed self-defense brought police intervention which martyrdom would not have done. African-Americans, Catholics, Jews, immigrants, and radicals were neither popular nor powerful in the areas in which the KKK thrived. Public authorities and influential private citizens might well have been content to see unarmed victims brutalized or slain, if the violence could have been so confined. **When victims arm themselves**, however, **authorities are compelled to act** lest incidents lead to widespread bloodshed and disorder.37 The point is simple: while protecting the powerless may not be a high priority for public authorities, preserving order is. **Police are likely to pay more attention to a man’s death than a woman’s rape**; **perhaps society would care more about the latter if it had the potential to impact the former**. **Widespread firearm ownership would** also **show that women are serious about putting an end to gender-based violence,** and willing to take responsibility for their own safety.38 Should they have to? No. A woman should have the absolute right to walk down a dark, deserted city street at 2:00 in the morning, wearing a short skirt, without threat of assault.39 But that is not currently a woman’s reality. Though rape is never the victim’s fault, women may be the only ones who can put a stop to it; **more women should get a gun, learn how to use it**, and cultivate a don’tmess-with-me attitude. Few men would dare assault a woman with a .38 in her hands and determination in her eyes—and those who do attempt it should immediately regret their decision. Most men cannot comprehend the grievous harms of rape and domestic violence,40 but a widespread movement to prevent victimization “by any means necessary” might help them begin to understand the consequences—both for women who are abused, and for men who attempt to harm an armed woman.41 If women defended themselves violently, the amount of damage they were willing to do to would-be assailants would be the measure of their seriousness about the limits beyond which they would not be pushed. If more women killed husbands or boyfriends who abused them or their children, perhaps there would be less abuse. **A large number of women refusing to be pushed any further would erode,** however slowly, **the myth of the masochistic female** which threatens all our lives**.**42 It is reasonable to believe that violence against women would decrease once men begin to realize that attacking a seemingly-defenseless woman could be their destruction. The ideal, naturally, is a society of men and women who respect each other as equals and do not use the threat of violence to dominate and control any group. Until then, the best strategy may be to achieve “a social equilibrium of nonviolence” by arming women.43 Offensive violence may beget more violence, but unyielding self-defense begets détente.44 **Peace would be preferable, but cessation of violence is essential.**

#### 3. Just like abortion, the right to choose self defense is a crucial one.

Charles 3:

There was a time in this country when women had few choices about any facet of their lives—perhaps the biggest choice a woman would ever make involved which man to marry as she moved from her father’s house to her husband’s house. American women today have many important choices: whether to pursue higher education, where and what kind; with whom to share her life and whether she ought to marry; her vocation; where she will live; whether to become a mother; and even how to vote, thanks to the Nineteenth Amendment, ratified a mere ninety years ago. Choices are necessary for the freedom “to do, not do, become, or not become something.”65 **Freedom to make choices**, **as well as freedom from** external forces such as **patriarchy** and violence, **are** both **necessary for autonomy**: the ability of an individual to define her own conception of the good and exercise control over her own life.66 **There are many factors that can reduce a woman’s choices** in life, and therefore her freedom. Economic status, education level, others’ prejudice, even past choices, can all reduce available choices; this is unfortunate, but perhaps unavoidable. However, **there is no reason for a government to reduce the selfdefense choices available** to an individual, because “gun control laws do not reduce crime.”67 **Women can be trusted to make good decisions for themselves**, even—or perhaps especially—in difficult situations. The most morally or politically difficult choices to allow may be the most important for a woman in crisis. **Abortion rights and gun rights** “**allow what might be crucial private choices in extreme personal crises**. **However we come down politically**, in truly desperate circumstances **many of us** might **want** for ourselves or someone we love **the option offered by these two most controversial rights.**”68 **The vast majority of women, if** they were honest with themselves, could **imagine a worst-case scenario in which they** might **want** the option of **an abortion. The same holds true for guns**, and in fact, may involve less of a moral dilemma because **the criminal aggressor has a malicious intent that the fetus lacks**.69 Therefore, even women who currently have no desire to own a gun should support the right to keep and bear arms, just as women not currently experiencing an unwanted pregnancy should support abortion rights. Since the crucial moment for an individual cannot be predicted in advance, the **rights must always be available and meaningful**— rather than a hollow guarantee, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Both freedom from and freedom to are necessary for women’s autonomy. Achieving freedom from the forces of patriarchy and its resulting evils will continue to be a long, difficult, uphill climb. By contrast, the **freedom** “to do, not do, become, or not become something” **can** **be** easily **realized by removing the restrictions on women’s choices.**

#### 4. Guns represent leveling a historical power imbalance between men and women that is key in breaking down the patriarchy.

**EYATES 15:**

**EYATES April 30, 2015 (It’s Not Just Protection: Why Millions of Women are Buying Guns. Fox 43.** [**http://fox43.com/2015/04/30/girls-with-guns-become-force-to-be-reckoned-with-as-millions-of-women-choose-to-arm-themselves/**](http://fox43.com/2015/04/30/girls-with-guns-become-force-to-be-reckoned-with-as-millions-of-women-choose-to-arm-themselves/)**)**

Shooting a gun can also take the edge off. The number of women going to gun ranges has jumped roughly 60 percent since 2001 to more than five million, according to the National Shooting Sports Foundation. "I work third shift and it's just, you get that ware on your body and the little things in life that you can handle but it adds a weight onto you that you can't keep off, but when I come in here and shoot it flows right off and I feel like I've restarted," said Harknett. **For the majority of female gun owners it's more than** just **a way to unwind**. **It means being equal because for thousands of years weapons** like swords and spears **required strength to operate, meaning a man** usually **held** the **power... but not** so **with a gun**. "**Firearms only rely on chemical reactivity to provide** the **power** to fire the weapon **so women can now be equivalent to men when it comes to confronting a violent situation** and succeeding," said Leola University psychology professor David Crough. Crough said that back in the days when we were hunter-gatherers people stayed in groups of about a hundred, making it easy to identify those who were dangerous. Now a days with bigger cities and denser populations **people can be anonymous more easily, creating a greater need for defense,** which he says is one of the reasons why as many as **20 million American women own guns**.

#### 5.Turns about increasing crime or murder rates turn the aff since more violence is a bad thing under the aff’s role of the ballot. The problem with guns is that they encourage violent, hypermasculinity, but obviously if a gun ban caused more gun proliferation or more gun violence then it would cause more hypermasculinity. Empirics prove—handgun bans in the US cause more murder.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

Finished with international comparisons, Dixon turns to interstate analysis. If gun controls reduced crime, then it would be expected that states with stricter gun laws would have lower gun crime rates. But as Dixon acknowledges, states with stricter gun laws have higher crime rates. [113] There are several possible explanations. First, the states which enacted the strict gun laws had high crime to begin with; that it why the stricter laws were enacted. A second, not inconsistent explanation, is that gun control itself causes higher crime, making the already high-crime states even worse than they would otherwise be. Dixon deals with the explanation by dismissing it as "perverse." [114] Argument by epithet is not persuasive, and (as will be discussed below), there are plausible reasons to believe that some gun controls may increase crime, and that Dixon's proposed handgun ban would substantially aggravate crime. [115] Dixon admits that at least sometimes handguns prevent crime, [116] so it is hardly "perverse" to suggest that it could be possible that states which weaken the deterrent effect of civilian handgun ownership suffer increased crime. A third explanation for why states with stern gun laws have more crime than other states is that guns from other states, with looser laws, are smuggled into the high crime states, thus reducing or eliminating the crime-reductive effect of the strict state's law. This explanation is not inconsistent with the first two explanations. Dixon devotes the rest of his interstate discussion to arguing for this third explanation. Even if Dixon's explanation about leakage is generally true, it remains difficult to account for the dismal performance of many gun controls. For example, in 1976 the Washington, D.C. murder rate stood at 26.9 per 100,000 population, according to FBI statistics. The city council enacted a handgun ban which went into effect in February \*316 1977, and since then the Washington rate has always been higher than 26.9 (except in 1985). [117] Today, the rate is three times higher than it was before the ban was enacted. [118] If handgun bans work, why would the homicide rate rise after 1977 (which was years before the "war on drugs" made Washington's homicide problem even worse)? Smuggling guns into Washington, D.C. from other states was no easier in 1980 than it was in 1976. The ban on possession by law-abiding citizens should have reduced the supply of handguns available for Washington, D.C. criminals to steal, and should have prevented law-abiding citizens from shooting each other with handguns in heat-of-passion homicides. The D.C. handgun ban's impact on law-abiding citizens would not be defeated by interstate smuggling, since law- abiding citizens would, be definition, not buy an illegal gun. And yet the Washington homicide rate rose. Similar increases in gun crime in other jurisdictions, such as Chicago after its own handgun ban, [119] and New York City after its severe "Sullivan" handgun licensing law, [120] at least raise doubt about the complete sufficiency of interstate gun smuggling as an explanation for the failure of the gun laws. If interstate smuggling were the whole story, then it would not be expected that crime rates would rise immediately after gun laws were enacted.

#### 6. Handgun ban forces criminals to switch to deadlier weapons—substantially increases murder rates.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

If handguns were somehow removed from the hands of malfeasants, would the death toll actually increase? Some gun misusers would switch to knives (not much less deadly than small handguns), while others would switch to rifles and shotguns (much more likely to kill than handguns). If enough misusers switched from handguns to long guns, the death toll might therefore increase, or so the "substitution argument" goes. Dixon confronts the substitution argument carefully, and provides one of the most comprehensive critiques of substitution theory ever offered by a handgun prohibitionist. \*327 Dixon is right to take the substitution argument seriously. While handgun wounds are usually survivable, especially if the victim gets medical attention quickly, shotgun blasts at close range are much more likely to be fatal. The shotgun fires a large slug, or from six to more than sixty pellets, with one trigger squeeze. A single shotgun pellet, because it may be of a diameter equal to a small handgun bullet, can inflict nearly as much damage as a small handgun bullet. [177] Wound ballistics and firearms experts concur that at short range, a shotgun is by far the deadliest weapon. [178] Anti-prohibition writers such as David Hardy, Gary Kleck, and Don Kates have argued that a high level of substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in the case of a hypothetical American handgun ban. Dixon offers a careful rebuttal of their arguments, and concludes that (since he has placed the burden of proof on prohibition opponents) the case for a substitution effect has not been proven convincingly enough to overcome what he considers the strong evidence for handgun prohibition. Overlooked in the discussion of a substitution effect resulting from a hypothetical American handgun ban is non- hypothetical evidence from other countries. As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [179] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [180] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [181] Let us \*328 assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [182] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - Dixon has explicitly assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere. [183] So why then do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws, and fewer handgun murders? One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. A sufficiently large number of Australians and Canadians, unable to obtain handguns, do their shooting with rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [184] \*329 Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson that if 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone. [185] A National Institute of Justice study of felons in state prisons found that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [186] A 72% substitution rate would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%. Dixon retorts that criminals are apt to be braggarts and liars, and might claim that nothing, including a handgun ban, could stop them from committing any crime they chose. Accordingly, the 72% substitution figure might be too high. True enough. But at the same time, at least some criminals may be highly suspicious and mistrustful of authority. Although the National Institute of Justice polling, conducted through written response to written questions, offered the respondents anonymity, some of the prisoners might have believed that their responses would not in fact be anonymous; the polling might be a "setup" to discern their plans after release, and provide a reason for denying parole. Thus, some handgun criminals might have falsely said that they would not substitute sawed-off shotguns for unavailable handguns. Do the number of braggart criminals who falsely said that they would use sawed-off shotguns outnumber the number of mistrustful criminals who falsely said they would not? It is difficult to say with certainty. But since 72% of the criminals said they would substitute, and since only 30% substitution is needed to increase substantially the homicide rate, there is a wide margin for error to assume that bragging criminals outnumber suspicious ones. Dixon critiques the Benenson and Kates estimate of a homicide rate increase because Benenson and Kates assumed that handgun users who did not switch to long guns would switch "downward" to the next most deadly weapon, knives. Almost certainly, some handgun users would, rather than using knives, turn to even less deadly weapons, such as fists, or would not attempt murder in the first place, absent a handgun. [187] But when calculating expected deaths resulting from substitution, Kates and Benenson assumed that none of the persons who switched to knives would kill anyone; in terms of resulting deaths, therefore, Kates and Benenson underestimated the \*330 deaths that would be caused by murderers who switched downward to less lethal weapons. Even assuming that none of the persons who switched down killed anyone, the homicide rate would double if half of the handgun-deprived criminals switched "up" to long guns. [188] Another tack taken by Dixon is to argue that high rates of substitution are unlikely because long guns are so inferior for most criminal purposes. He notes first of all that less than 10% of murders are currently perpetrated with long guns. [189] This is true, but, as Dixon strenuously argues, handguns are widely preferred as murder weapons, and widely available. Thus, it should not be surprising that more than 6 out of 7 gun murderers chose the "best" tool, a handgun. But what people choose when the "best" option is available does not prove how they would behave if only inferior options were available. Today, virtually all hard liquor drinkers consume the "best" hard liquor available - namely legally-produced hard liquor whose production is regulated by the government to guarantee standards of safety. Probably less than 5% of American hard liquor consumers drink bathtub gin, moonshine, and other home- brewed liquors whose safety cannot be guaranteed. Does the fact prove that very few liquor drinkers would, if legal liquor became unavailable, substitute home-brewed liquor? To the contrary, the experience of alcohol prohibition showed that a large percentage of liquor consumers, if unable to obtain safe, legal liquor, will switch to inferior, dangerous homemade liquor. [190] That murderers only rarely use long guns today does not prove that murders would eschew long guns if handguns were unavailable, any more than drinkers of legal liquor would eschew bathtub gin. [191] As another argument against substitution, Dixon points out that long guns are less concealable than handguns. Even when sawed off, a shotgun is still about 11 inches long, making it slightly larger than big handguns, and much larger than the small, low-caliber handguns which are frequently used in crime. Would sawed-off shotguns frequently be substituted in a \*331 robberies? Putting an 11 inch shotgun in one's front pocket would not be very effective concealment. On the other hand, sticking the shotgun in the inner pocket of a large coat or jacket would seem reasonably effective. Accordingly, it is plausible to infer that persons who execute planned robberies would substitute concealed shotguns. At the same time, criminals who simply carried handguns with them, and spontaneously perpetrated robberies when the opportunity arose, might not be able to carry concealed shotguns so frequently. Thus, impulsive handgun robberies would suffer less of a substitution effect than would planned robberies. Since casual carrying of firearms in general might decrease, so might the shootings that result from the casual insults and provocations that can occur on the street. Hence, it is reasonable to conclude that an effective handgun ban might prevent some shootings. But again, only a 30% substitution rate would be necessary for total homicides to rise substantially. What about in the home? It is the home, after all, rather than in robberies of stores, where the larger number of handgun homicides currently occur. Dixon argues that even in the home, the concealability of handguns is important. He asserts that substantial portion of the murders in 1989 involved "friends or acquaintances who may have been unaware that the person they are visiting is carrying a concealed weapon." [192] First of all, there is no evidence as to how many of those murderers actually were carrying a concealed weapon of which the victim was unaware. For the sake of argument, assume that all of the murders would have been prevented had handguns not been available; there is still a long way to go for the substitution ratio to be reduced below 30%, and thus not cause a net increase in homicides. Next, Dixon writes that "the ease of pulling out the [hand]gun and shooting makes such arguments far more likely to spill over into murder. In contrast, by the time the assaulter has gone into another room to retrieve their [sic] long gun and loaded it, the potential victim has crucial seconds in which to escape." [193] Here, Dixon assumes that the domestic handgun murderers were carrying the handgun on their body, rather than storing the handgun in another room. He likewise assumes that the substituted long gun would be stored in "another room" rather than the room in which the argument was taking place. He further assumes that the handguns used in the domestic shootings were loaded, but the substituted long guns would not be loaded. All of these assumptions may be simultaneously true some of the time, thus making Dixon's escape scenario plausible in \*332 some instances. (Although not every potential victim would know that the potential murderer was loading a long gun in the other room, and even then, some might not run away.) [194] But it is highly speculative to assume that Dixon's scenario of the unloaded long gun in the other room replacing the loaded handgun carried on the person would be the predominant scenario. Even if we speculatively assume that the unloaded long gun scenario would transpire more than 50% of the time, all that is needed for an increase in the death rate is a 30% substitution rate. While Dixon argues convincingly that substitution would not be universal, the evidence easily supports the conclusion that substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in at least 30% of current handgun murder situations, thus leading to a substantial increase in total deaths.

#### 7. Literature review proves no solvency. Kates and Mauser 07

(Don B. Kates (LL.B., Yale, 1966) is an American criminologist and constitutional lawyer associated with the Pacific Research Institute, Gary Mauser (Ph.D., University of California, Irvine, 1970), WOULD BANNING FIREARMS REDUCE MURDER AND SUICIDE?, Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy [Vol. 30 No. 2], 2007. NS

In this connection, two recent studies are pertinent. In 2004, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences released its evaluation from a review of 253 journal articles, 99 books, 43 government publications, and some original empirical research. It failed to identify any gun control that had reduced violent crime, suicide, or gun accidents.15 The same conclusion was reached in 2003 by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control’s review of then-extant studies.16

#### Gun control gives racist law enforcement more power- reentrenches the racism already present in mass incarceration

Alex Gourevitch. June 24, 2015. “Gun control’s racist reality: The liberal argument against giving police more power”. Assistant professor of political science at Brown University. Author of From Slavery to the Cooperative Commonwealth: Labor and Republican Liberty in the Nineteenth Century

The dead are buried, the murderer apprehended, and the shock has started to wear off. Now comes the public reaction to the massacre in Charleston. Soon after the shootings at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, the first black president of the United States offered some thoughts on Dylan Roof’s racist attack. First and foremost, President Obama said, recent events were about how “innocent people were killed in part because someone who wanted to inflict harm had no trouble getting their hand on a gun.” The killings were also about a “dark chapter in our history,” namely racial slavery and Jim Crow. Obama only suggested practical action regarding the first issue, namely gun control. He did not consider that such measures will make the persistence of the second problem even worse. It is perhaps counterintuitive to say so but gun control responses to mass killings – whether racially motivated or otherwise – are a deep mistake. The standard form of gun control means writing more criminal laws, creating new crimes, and therefore creating more criminals or more reasons for police to suspect people of crimes. More than that, it means creating yet more pretexts for a militarized police, full of racial and class prejudice, to overpolice. As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. From SWAT to stop-and-frisk to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control. As a consequence, more than 7 million Americans are subject to some form of correctional control, an extremely disproportionate number of whom are poor and minority. While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing gun control efforts also play an important role. One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program, was justified as a gun control rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence. This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. Possession is far more widespread than can possibly be policed so decisions have to be made about where to devote resources. Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.” In other words, there must be selective enforcement, where enforcement includes invasive searches based on existing prejudices about who is and isn’t dangerous. For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows steep, and unfounded, bias. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “The New Jim Crow,” saying the following: “I had an [assistant U.S. attorney who] wanted to drop the gun charge against the defendant [in a case which] there were no extenuating circumstances. I asked, ‘Why do you want to drop the gun offense?’ And he said, ‘He’s a rural guy and grew up on a farm. The gun he had with him was a rifle. He’s a good ol’ boy, and all good ol’ boys have rifles, and it’s not like he was a gun-toting drug dealer.’ But he was a gun-toting drug dealer, exactly.” This isn’t just a point about conscious and unconscious biases towards poor minorities – biases that some imagine can be removed with proper training. No matter how neutral the laws are, their enforcement must remain unequal and unfair. That is because the policing involved would never be tolerated if they affected politically influential groups to the same degree. These policing practices persist because they are disproportionately directed against marginal populations. Once individuals find themselves arrested gun control reappears as a reason for increasing punishment. Gun possession can be used to enhance sentences for other crimes and even functions as a kind of double punishment when that possession becomes the reason for also tacking on an extra criminal charge. Gun charges are also a part of the excessive and racially unequal over-charging practices that not only contribute to rising incarceration rates but also ends force numerous individuals away from trial and into plea bargains. Poor Blacks and Latinos are easily intimidated by charge-happy prosecutors into accepting plea deals, meaning they never see their day in court. Some even end up admitting to crimes they did not commit just to avoid the possibility of more severe punishments. More criminal gun laws would only feed this deeply unjust system. There is an unrecognized gap between the justification for gun control and its most likely effect. There is no reason to expect fair enforcement of gun control laws, or even that they will mainly be used to someone prevent these massacres. That is because how our society polices depends not on the laws themselves but on how the police – and prosecutors and courts – decide to enforce the law. Especially given how many guns there are in the U.S., gun law enforcement will be selective. That is to say, they will be unfairly enforced, only deepening the injustices daily committed against poor minorities in the name of law and order. It is hard to imagine any feasible gun control laws doing much to decrease mass shootings. But it is easy to see how they will become part of the system of social control of mostly black, mostly poor people. There are already too many crimes, there is too much criminal law, and there is far too much incarceration — especially of black people. To the degree that all that is part of the “dark chapter in our history,” given the deep injustice of our society, and especially its policing practices, the actual practice of gun control will continue that dark chapter, not resolve it. Of course, a reasonable gun control regime is logically possible. We can imagine one in our heads. But it is not politically possible in the United States right now. And it is a great error to think that gun control is the path to racial justice. More likely, it is the other way around. Racial justice is a precondition for any reasonable gun control regime. That, perhaps, is why the demands that have emerged from the #blacklivesmatter movement focus not on gun control but instead on demilitarizing the police and investing in “jobs, housing, and schools” for those “black communities most devastated by poverty.” What happened in Charleston is a horrific tragedy. The criminal law will not solve it. I wish I had a better solution ready at hand. I don’t, though I think it would start by freeing our political imagination from instinctively reaching for the criminal law

### Defense

#### Christianity is an alt cause

YOUR AUTHOR Levi Gahman 15, Centre for Social, Spatial, and Economic Justice, University of British Columbia. Gun rites: hegemonic masculinity and neoliberal ideology in rural Kansas. Gender, Place and Culture

Thus, to further explain the masculinist norms governing Southeast Kansas, it is necessary to look at the proliferation of neoliberal ideology within the USA, as well as how it has been fused with local Christian beliefs that the region is ritually subjected to. For many of the participants, the tenets of neoliberalism (privatization, deregulation, free enterprise, cuts to social welfare, etc.) have fused with conservative Christianity to manufacture individualistic subjectivities that hold fast to the conviction that what one does in life (or does not do) in relation to Christian dogma, work ethic, and self-reliance determines their social standing as well as what happens to them in the afterlife. As a result, many participants expressed a desire to be ‘successful’, ‘good’, and ‘respectable’. Several men noted that achieving those goals is solely a matter of personal responsibility based upon the decisions they make, which are often closely linked to religious practice. Consequently, these liberal subjectivities leave little room for factoring in larger sociopolitical structures that influence the decisions people are allowed to make. As such, the interlocking influences of race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, age, and nationality often go unnoticed, remain invisible, or are dismissed altogether in favour of blaming or praising individual choices. Accordingly, the role of being ‘head of the household’ typically becomes the duty of the man, and his ability to protect and defend is often seen as an extension of his dedication to his loved ones. The propagation of such patriarchal beliefs is a direct result of the indoctrination that community members receive from socially conservative clergy members, a colonial education system, and corporatized media/marketing that endorses heteronormative social relationships. The result is the reification of an increasingly atomized mindset in which individuals believe they are solely responsible for their own social position in life. For men in rural Southeast Kansas, this is made manifest in the belief that they are in exclusive control of their own ability to succeed. As the well-being of the family is a core value for many men in the area, the subsequent safeguarding of their wife and children is paramount. In turn, owning a gun is thus reaffirmed as a symbol of masculine conviction and commitment to the family. Various research has also noted that gun ownership is closely tied to the role a man has in providing for his family, bonding with his children, and passing down technical expertise to future generations (Cox 2007; Stroud 2012). The role of the gun for many young children has become a prominent rite of passage and nostalgic symbol of time spent with their father. In Southeast Kansas these narratives of father–son (and sometimes daughter) bonding are usually couched with qualifiers noting that ‘safety and respect’ are first and foremost when handling guns. Several participants mentioned being taught to ‘respect’ guns, learning that firearms are to be used primarily for sport/hunting/protection, and that caution should always be taken in order to ensure safety. At times, these narratives of safety and respect serve to distance guns from their associations as weapons by suggesting they are simply ancestral heirlooms. This rhetorical act of removing violence from guns and framing them as objects used in rites of passage is highlighted by James, a 32-year-old father, when asked about his thoughts on whether guns led to violence.

#### No aff solvency – shootings are a result of hegemonic masculinity, not the other way around and there are alt causes to that

[Their author] Esposito and Finley 14 [Esposito, Luigi, and Laura L. Finley. Luigi Esposito, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of Sociology and Criminology at Barry University in Miami Shores, FL. Laura Finley, Ph.D. is Assistant professor of Sociology and Criminology at Barry University in Miami Shores, FL. "Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States." Theory in Action 7.2 (2014): 74.]

As Messerschmidt (1993), Messerschmidt and Connell (2005), Katz (2006), and others have noted, men learn that to “do masculinity” means to act aggressively. That is, gender is not innate but instead something that is nurtured throughout the life course and via numerous institutions. Male gender norms generally promote risk-taking, aggression, and encourage men to exert dominance, both over other men as well as over women (Katz, 2006). This behavior parallels th/e sort of agency encouraged in a neoliberal market society. Consistent with C.B. Mcpherson’s (1962) notion of “possessive individualism,” subjects under neoliberalism are encouraged to “exercise their domination over things” in the form of ownership or possession. Because a neoliberal market society is structured around relations of ultra-competition, this also suggests that individuals must constantly protect—through virtually any means necessary— their possessions from others. In this context, “possessions” might refer not only to material goods but also to one’s family, ego, and sense of self-worth. McPherson’s notion of possessive individualism is consistent with what Messerschmidt and Connell (2005) call hegemonic masculinity, and it remains the dominant form of masculinity in the United States. Hegemonic masculinity tells men that they are of most value when they stand up for themselves and those they care for against either physical or verbal attacks. Far from simply self-defense or coming to the aid of others, however, this sort of response is often motivated by a sense of entitlement. For example, in his interviews with more than 400 young men for his book Guyland, Kimmel (2009 ) described a strong sense of entitlement among his respondents. Because they were entitled to feel like real men, fighting back against anyone who challenges them was deemed to be normal and appropriate. This idea also receives support from a Mother Jones study which found that of the 62 mass shootings that occurred in the U.S since 1982, 61 have been perpetrated by (mostly White) men. According to Tim Wise (2012), the fact that the overwhelming majority of these mass shootings have been carried out by White men might have something to do with what he calls the “pathology of privilege” (2012). Namely, many of these men have, in one way or another –through having experienced being bullied, marginalized, made to feel as if they did not “belong,” etc.—decided to “strike back” against a society that they, as men, believe has not only emasculated them but deprived them of the privileges they feel are rightfully theirs (particularly as White men). Similarly, Pinker’s (1997) anthropological work expresses the connections between mass violence and masculinity. He and Kellner (2008) referred to the perpetrators as “men amok.” These men feel as though they have lost their dignity and masculinity, and the only way to respond—and therefore restore their masculine pride—is to act out in a violent and spectacular fashion. Examinations of the actions of mass shooters provide support for Pinker’s work. Kellner (2008) discusses the dossier that Virginia Tech shooter Seung-Hui Cho sent to media outlets in advance of the shooting, noting that guns were a central tool in his hypermasculine posturing. Documents show that Cho had felt emasculated and had thus become infatuated with guns right before the shooting, having purchased one from a local store and another on the internet. Cho bought ammunition on the Internet, practiced at a shooting range, and went to the gym to “immerse himself in ultramasculinist gun culture” (Kellner, 2008, p. 49). Although Cho was Asian and therefore removed from the sense of entitlement associated with “White privilege,” it is obvious his actions were, to a large extent, inspired by a perceived attack on his manhood. Similarly, Columbine shooters Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold were, according to some reports, bullied by hyper-masculine jocks and therefore sought to recuperate their manly images through ultraviolence— amassing an arsenal of weapons, and attacking those who had slighted them (Kellner, 2008). New York Times columnist Bob Herbert (2007), in explaining the actions of several mass shooters, wrote: The killers have been shown to be young men riddled with shame and humiliation, often bitterly misogynistic and homophobic, who have decided that the way to assert their faltering sense of manhood and get the respect they have been denied is to go out and shoot somebody. It is clear that in the U.S., the ideal of “real” manhood is very much tied to violence and defending oneself, one’s family, and one’s domain. This is entirely consistent with the neoliberal emphasis on extreme competition and self-reliance. In another example of how neoliberalism promotes violence by supporting hegemonic masculinity, conservative pundits argued that the students and faculty at Virginia Tech were “wussified” because they succumbed to the fire power of Seung-Hui Cho and allegedly did not “fight back” (cited in Kellner, 2008, p. 44). As Shirch (2012, online) explains, The responsibility for pulling the trigger was one man. But it is a collective mistake to keep reliving this national nightmare and not ask questions about the quality of our policy-making, about the care we put into constructing the foundations of our society. The U.S. media stumbles over its analysis of mental illness, the rage of young men brought up to prove their masculinity through violence and threats. Men all over the world are too often rewarded and even urged by the media to demonstrate their masculinity by brandishing weapons. If it is masculine to act violently, gun in hand, then the government can almost be seen as emasculating, as it takes the place of the individual man to “take care of his own business.” As noted earlier, gun manufacturers have, in recent years, sought to exploit the fears of men— in particular, White men (Wise, 2012). A recent advertisement for the .223-calibre semi-automatic Bushmaster rifle that Adam Lanza used, which is the civilian version of the weapons U.S. soldiers use in Afghanistan and Iraq, played up the link between guns and masculinity in its tag line, “Consider your man-card reissued” (Gray, 2012). Bushmaster Firearms issued a press release in 2010 in which the company described how one becomes a “card-carrying man.” It stated: ...visitors of bushmaster.com will have to prove they're a man by answering a series of manhood questions. Upon successful completion, they will be issued a temporary Man Card to proudly display to friends and family. The Man Card is valid for one year. Visitors can also call into question or even revoke the Man Card of friends they feel have betrayed their manhood. The man in question will then have to defend himself, and their Man Card, by answering a series of questions geared towards proving indeed, they are worthy of retaining their card (Gray, 2012).

#### Alt cause – assault rifles still exist and most aff evidence is in the context of AR-15’s

#### Missing reverse causal evidence that says banning handguns solves heg masculinity – even if guns created it you need evidence that says the ban solves
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